

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in this application, Claims 1-14 having been amended and new Claim 15 having been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 6-14 are objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(c) as improper multiple dependent claims and were not examined on the merits; and Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)¹ as anticipated by Kanekar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751, 191).

Claims 1-14 are amended to more clearly describe and more distinctly claim Applicant's invention and no new matter is added. Claims 6-14 are amended to remove the improper multiple dependencies. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that Claims 6-14 be examined on the merits.

Support for new Claim 15 is found in original Claim 1, for example, and therefore no new matter is added.

With respect to the rejection of independent Claim 1 as anticipated by Kanekar, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanekar does not teach or suggest every element of amended Claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a network router including at least one generic router configured to route data between input devices and output devices. A memory unit is configured to store a configuration file including parameters of a given set of routings between said input devices and output devices. The memory unit is further configured to store a routing table. The generic router is further configured to load a subset or routings from said configuration file into the routing table and to execute the routings between the

¹ Kanekar et al. is not prior art under 102(b), but is prior art under 102(e) and the present response treats it as such.

input devices and output devices according to the configuration file loaded into the routing table. This configuration has the advantage that it can satisfy a large variety of needs without requiring the development of specific routing and processing software.²

Amended Claim 1 recites “...a memory unit configured to store a configuration file including parameters of a given set of routings between said input devices and output devices....” Indeed, Kanekar does not teach or suggest the claimed “configuration file.”

On the contrary, Kanekar teaches a routing system that includes a master router and a slave router.³ Kanekar intentionally builds in redundancy so that if the master router fails, the slave router can operate in its place.⁴ For the slave router to operate in place of the master router, Kanekar teaches synchronizing the configurations of the master and slave routers.⁵ There are three categories of information that may be configured for each router. There is information that must be the same, information that must be different, and information that can be different, but is recommended to be the same.⁶ The configuration information is read from a configuration file.⁷ However, this configuration file includes the parameters of the master and slave routers, and not “parameters of a given set of routings between said input devices and output devices.”

Fig. 4 of Kanekar shows a configuration file as taught by Kanekar. Kanekar’s configuration table includes parameters for the two routers, such as their IP addresses and designations as to which one is the master and which one is the alternate.⁸ Therefore, Kanekar does not teach or suggest the claimed “...a memory unit configured to store a configuration file including parameters of a given set of routings between said input devices and output devices....”

² Specification, page 3, lines 9-11.

³ Kanekar, col. 2, lines 14-15.

⁴ Kanekar, col. 2, lines 22-24.

⁵ Kanekar, col. 4, lines 18-19.

⁶ Kanekar, col. 4, lines 21-25.

⁷ Kanekar, col. 10, lines 42-44.

⁸ Kanekar, Fig. 4 and col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 17

Furthermore, because Kanekar does not teach or suggest the Claimed “configuration file,” Kanekar does not teach or suggest the claimed “...wherein the generic router is further configured to load a subset of routings from said configuration file into said routing table and to execute the routings between said input devices and output devices according to the configuration file loaded into said routing table.”

In view of the above noted distinctions, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 (and its dependent Claims 2-14) patentably distinguish over Kanekar. Claim 15 is similar to Claim 1, and Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15 patentably distinguishes over Kanekar for at least the same reasons stated above for Claim 1.

Consequently, in view of the above amendments and comments, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding rejection is traversed and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
I:\ATTY\JW\205984us\205984US AMEND.DOC